

Reply to Office Action dated January 13, 2004  
Application No. 09/114,352

### **REMARK/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-22 are presently active; Claims 1 and 8-22 having been amended by the present amendment.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al (U.S. Patent 5,579,055) in view of Davis et al (U.S. Patent 5,559,548) and further in view of Klosterman (U.S. patent 5,550,576). Claims 11-14 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al in view of Terasawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,147,714).

This amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 which after final rejection permits entering of amendments canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action, or presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. The present amendment clarifies that the recited preference given to the provider tag of the first broadcasting station is displayed within a row of the display that includes at least the provider tag and a program name. The display of a preference within a row of the display that includes at least the provider tag and a program name is shown in Applicants' Figures 6 and 12, does not constitute new matter, and presents the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

As noted, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the preference given to the provider tag of the first broadcasting station is displayed within a row of the display that includes at least

Reply to Office Action dated January 13, 2004  
Application No. 09/114,352

the provider tag and a program name.

Davis et al, cited in the outstanding Office Action for its teaching of providing a preference to one of the provider tags, do not disclose or suggest that the preference is made within a row of the display including at least the provider tag and a program name. Davis et al display only one piece of information in the region cited in the Office Action as showing a preference (i.e., the product logo region of Figure 5a). In the rows listing channels and program names, Davis et al show no preference.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the presently amended independent Claims 1 and 8-22, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably define over the applied prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Registration No. 40,073  
Attorney of Record  
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618

CUSTOMER NUMBER  
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413-2220

BDL:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\203593US\AMFNL1.DOC